



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/650,894	08/28/2003	Jason Robert McGee	RSW920030102US1	8718
36736	7590	01/23/2009		
DUKE W. YEE YEE & ASSOCIATES, P.C. P.O. BOX 802333 DALLAS, TX 75380			EXAMINER BATES, KEVIN T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2456	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/23/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptonotifs@yeeiplaw.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/650,894		MCGEE ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	KEVIN BATES		2456	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 November 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-12 and 14-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-12 and 14-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is in response to a communication made on November 19, 2008.

Claims 3 and 13 have been cancelled.

Claims 1, 7, 11, 12, and 14-20 have been amended.

Claims 1-2, 4-12, and 14-20 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 4, 6-12, and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li (6519594) in view of Spotswood (2004/0255293).

Regarding claims 1, 11, and 19, Li teaches a method of generating a logically merged web module for a web application, comprising:

Responsive to a determination that a shared module designation file exists, identifying at least one shared web module from the shared module designation file to be incorporated into a application to form at least one identified shared module (Col. 8, lines 10 – 21; Col. 8, lines 50-55; Col. 10, lines 26 - 31), wherein the shared designation file includes all descriptors that reference the at least one shared module (Col. 9, lines 16 – 32);

locating the at least one identified shared module using path information (Col. 8, line 67- Col. 9, line 4; Col. 9, lines 16-32); and

logically merging the at least one shared module with modules of the web application, in accordance with the shared module designation file to generate a logically merged web application (Col. 10, lines 26 – 49), wherein a reference to the at least one shared web module is used in the logically merged application rather than a copy of the at least one shared module (Col. 8, lines 22-26).

Li does not explicitly indicate that the applications and modules comprise web applications and its modules.

Spotswood teaches that web applications can be run using java virtual machine on a web server (¶56-62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Spotswood's teaching of web applications and their use of web modules and java classes to expand Li's teaching of shared java classes to include web applications running in java virtual machine.

Regarding claims 2, 12, and 20, Li teaches the method of claims 1, 11, and 19, further comprising: loading the logically merged application into a container (Col. 9, lines 5 – 15).

Li does not explicitly indicate a web application running on a web container.

Spotswood teaches that web applications can be run using java virtual machine on a web server (¶56-62), where the applications are run using on a web container (¶76).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Spotswood's teaching of web applications and their use of web modules and java classes to expand Li's teaching of shared java classes to include web applications running in java virtual machine.

Regarding claim 4, Li teaches the method of claim 1.

Li does not explicitly indicate wherein the web application is an enterprise archive (EAR) and wherein the logically merged web application is a logically merged EAR.

Spotswood teaches that web applications can be run using java virtual machine on a web server (¶56-62), indicate wherein the web application is an enterprise archive (EAR) and wherein the logically merged web application is a logically merged EAR (¶49-53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Spotswood's teaching of web applications and their use of web modules and java classes to expand Li's teaching of shared java classes to include web applications running in java virtual machine.

Regarding claims 6 and 14, Li teaches the method of claims 1 and 11, wherein logically merging the at least one shared web module with web modules of the web application includes: determining a priority associated with the at least one shared web module (Col. 9, lines 59 – 67); and resolving any conflicts between shared web modules in the at least one shared web module and conflicts between the at least one shared web module and web modules of the web application, if any (Col. 8, lines 10 – 21).

Regarding claims 7 and 15, Li teaches the method of claims 1 and 11, wherein the steps of identifying, locating, and logically merging are performed during an initialization process of a runtime environment for initializing the web application to be run on a server (Col. 8, lines 40 – 62).

Regarding claim 8, Li teaches the method of claim 1, wherein logically merging the at least one shared web module with the web modules of the web application includes using a service provider interface (SPI) that provides merge logic for merging different module types (Col. 8, lines 40 – 62).

Regarding claims 9 and 17, Li teaches the method of claims 2 and 12, wherein the container uses one or more application program interfaces (APIs) to identify a path to the at least one shared web module and loads the at least one shared web module when loading the logically merged web application (Col. 9, lines 5 – 9).

Regarding claims 10 and 18, Li teaches the method of claims 1 and 11, wherein logically merging the at least one shared web module with web modules of the web application includes at least one of re-linking references to the at least one shared web module in the web modules of the web application, extrapolating policy information for the at least one shared web module from a policy file associated with the web application, and modifying a class path for the web application to include paths to each of the at least one shared web modules (Col. 9, lines 16 – 31; lines 61 – 67).

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li in view of Spotswood, and further in view of Sharma (6721777).

Regarding claim 5, the combined teaching of Li and Spotswood disclose method of claim 1.

The combination does not explicitly indicate wherein the at least one shared web module includes at least one of a web archive (WAR) file, an enterprise java bean (EJB) archive file, and a resource archive (RAR) file.

Sharma teaches that in addition to the java classes that are shared between applications taught in Li, that web applications can also share resource adaptor modules (Col. 3, lines 13 – 15; lines 29-39).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include these resource adapters in Li's shared memory space to ensure that memory usage gets saved by only running one resource adapter at a time and sharing it between applications.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed November 19, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claim 19, the claim amendments overcome the 101 rejection, thus it is hereby withdrawn.

Regarding claim 1, the applicant argues A) that Li does not teach a shared module designation file, B) that Li does not teach using path information to locate a module, and C) that Li does not teach “wherein a reference to the at least one shared

web module is used in the logically merged application rather than a copy of the at least one shared module.”

The examiner disagrees.

A) ¶46 of the specification characterizes the shared module designation file as a part of a web application that identifies the modules of the web application that can be shared web modules. Li teaches that a JVM is a java application executing on a system which has the ability to share java modules (Col. 7, lines 52 – 59; Col. 8, lines 15 – 18). That Java application makes sure each module it needs to operate gets created (Col. 8, lines 26 – 32). Those modules include modules which are shared between two or more simultaneous java applications (Col. 8, lines 29 – 55). So clearly from this teaching Li teaches that the java applications contain references to modules which has the ability to share use with other java applications as to the teaching of a designation file as described in the claimed invention.

B) Li teaches using path information to identifying modules in the shared memory space (Col. 8, lines 29 – 55; Col. 9, lines 16 – 32) .

C) Li teaches that the java application has shared access to modules and does not create copies of each module (Col. 8, lines 22-26).

Regarding claim 2, the applicant argues that Li does not teach logical merging of web applications into a container. The examiner disagrees; the idea of “logical” merging implies that the merging is not an action merging into one web container, but logically, through reference the module that is shared with other applications is functionally part of

the web container. Li teaches that each java application can reference and use the shared modules, thus showing logical merging (Col. 9, lines 5 - 15).

Regarding claim 4, the applicant appears to be attacking the references independently and needs to consider the combination of the teachings. As shown in the response to claim 2, Li teaches a logical merged application.

Regarding claim 6, the applicant argues that Li does not teaching having a priority to resolve conflicts. The examiner disagrees; Li teaches a basic concept of "priority" by having one application have a lock on a shared application, thus having the highest priority to access that module until it gives up access. This provides conflict resolution by not allowing any other application access to the class until the application with the lock gives up control (Col. 9, lines 59 - 67).

Regarding claim 7, it is unclear what the applicant is implying Li does not teach. As shown in the mapping to claim 1, Li teaches the steps of identifying, locating, and logically merging. Li further discloses the applications are initialized (Col. 8, lines 10 - 21) thus those steps are performed at application initialization as claimed in claim 7.

Regarding claim 8, see the response to claim 2.

Regarding claim 9, the applicant argues that the reference Li does not disclose a web container. The examiner disagrees, Li teaches a java embodiment of the concept which uses java execution spaces (Col. 7, lines 52 - 57), as shown in the teaching of Spotswood, it would be obvious to incorporate the concept of web services which utilize containers instead of execution spaces to perform the same function.

Regarding claim 10, the applicant argues that Li does not disclose a policy information in a policy files. The examiner disagrees; Li teaches utilizing path information to access the shared modules, and follows rules upon accessing those shared modules (Col. 10, lines 27 - 50), thus implements the policy of the application.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KEVIN BATES whose telephone number is (571) 272-3980. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on (571) 272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kevin Bates/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2456